DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 042 CS 505 507

AUTHOR Wiseman, Richard L.; And Others
TITLE A Normative Analysis of the Communication between Disabled and Nondisabled Persons.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (72nd, Chicago, IL, November 13-16, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adaptive Behavior (of Disabled); Behavior Standards; *Communication Problems; *Communication Research; *Disabilities; Helplessness; Intercultural Communication; *Interpersonal Communication; Personal Autonomy; *Self Concept; Social Attitudes; Social Behavior; Stereotypes; Subcultures
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Patterns

ABSTRACT

A study examined the communication problems between nondisabled and disabled persons. A questionnaire was created based on a theoretical model of intercultural communication involving three levels of analysis: intrapersonal, interpersonal, and systematic. One hundred and two nondisabled and 40 disabled subjects reacted to a helping situation depicted by the questionnaire between a nondisabled helper and a disabled recipient. Results indicated that nondisabled persons may feel compelled to act as they do in order to maintain a positive self-concept. On the other hand, disabled persons are compelled to be dependent in order to fulfill societal and relational demands. One effect of this asymmetric power relationship is a phenomenon called learned helplessness; the disabled person is taught to be dependent and expect personal failure. Further, the disabled persons are in a no-win situation: they can either rebel against social expectations and risk alienation or acquiesce to helping behavior and confirm their dependency. Also, compared to nondisabled subjects' perceptions, disabled subjects felt there were greater situational demands, relational constraints, and cultural prescriptions for the disabled person's behavior. In other words, they felt disabled persons' behavior is governed by social standards while nondisabled persons' behavior is governed by personal standards. (A three-page bibliography and tables of data are appended.) (SRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279042

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Normative Analysis of the Communication between Disabled and Nondisabled Persons

by

Richard L. Wiseman
Speech Communication Department
California State University
Fullerton, CA 92634
714-773-3617

Robert Emry
Speech Communication Department
California State University, Fullerton

Daniel J. Morgan
Department of Psychology
California State University, Fullerton

and

Jack Messamer
Department of Psychology
California State University, Fullerton

This research was partially funded by a President's Summer Research Grant awarded to the first author by California State University at Fullerton, 1985. The paper was presented on the "Top 4" panel of the Intercultural Communication Division of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, November 1986.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard L. Wiseman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS 505 507

A Normative Analysis of the Communication between Disabled and Nondisabled Persons

ABSTRACT

Communication between disabled and nondisabled persons in our society is governed by conflicting social and personal norms. This study examined the communication problems between nondisabled and disabled persons. To investigate the communication between nondisabled and disabled persons, a theoretical model of intercultural communication was tested via the coordinated management of meaning methodology. The model suggests three levels of analysis: intrapersonal, interpersonal, and systemic. A helping situation was developed depicting the communication between a nondisabled helper and a disabled helpee. Our questionnaire was administered to 102 nondisabled and 40 disabled persons. A series of MANOVA and ANOVA statistical procedures were used to evaluate the data. The results indicated that there were differences in disabled and nondisabled subjects' perceptions of the normative forces governing their respective behaviors. The nature of the perceptual differences were discussed and the implications for future research were noted.

A Normative Analysis of the Communication between Disabled and Nondisabled Persons

Securing acceptance is a major problem for the 11 million disabled Americans between the ages of 16 and 64. Persons who are disabled or otherwise seen as different from the norms of society all too often find themselves cut off from the larger society and, at times, forced into an oppressed subculture. For the disabled subculture, some of the barriers to meaningful social interaction and participation in society are physical, however, other less observable communication-related factors seem to be the most significant. Being disabled has a negative effect on relationships and communication between disabled and nondisabled persons (Farina, Sherman, & Allen, 1968; Kleck, 1966, 1968, 1969; Thompson, 1984). The disability takes on social meaning and the consequences impinge on both the disabled and nondisabled communicator. The result is strained communicative experiences (Braithwaite, Emry, & Wiseman, 1984; Deegan, 1977). Disabled and nondisabled communicators are caught in situations that are governed by conflicting social and personal norms as well as stereotypic perceptions that tend "to segregate the disabled subculture from mainstream culture and reinforce social misconceptions of the disabled subculture" (Emry & Wiseman, 1985, p. 1).

The purposes of the present paper are three-fold: First, we will explore an application of a model of intercultural communication to help explain the interaction between nondisabled and disabled persons. Second, the paper will then examine a theoretical conceptualization of communication, viz., The Coordinated Management of Meaning, to help test some of the predictions regarding disabled and nondisabled persons' communication based on the model of intercultural communication. Third,

the paper will present our findings regarding both disabled and nondisabled subjects' perceptions of a rather ubiguitous, yet misunderstood, communication situation, i.e., a situation where a nondisabled person gives help to a person with a disability. The hope is to develop a better understanding of the interaction between disabled and nondisabled persons.

Emry and Wiseman (1985) have analyzed nondisabled and disabled persons' communication from an intercultural perspective employing a three-tier model of intercultural communication developed by Rohrlich (1983). Their analysis examined nondisabled and disabled persons' communication from three levels: (1) perceptions of self and others (intrapersonal level); (2) interpretations of the others' intentional communication efforts (interpersonal level); and (3) processural outcomes of self and others (systemic level).

Intrapersonal Level: This level of analysis focuses on the communicator's subjective cultural experiences which result in attitudes, roles, values, and other constructs which affect the communicator's perceptions of reality. When applied to nondisabled and disabled communicators, each person is seen as being captured in conflicting social and personal demands. For the nondisabled person, these conflicting demands result in approach/avoidance feelings to disabled persons. On the one hand, society mandates that disabled persons be treated kindly and be taken care of (Kelley, Hastorf, Jones, Thibaut, & Usdane, 1960). On the other hand, certain factors motivate the nondisabled person to avoid the disabled persons: First, nondisabled persons assume the disabled person has different personality traits, moral characteristics, social abilities, and political attitudes (Heinemann, Pellander, Vogelbusch & Wojtek, 1981; Weinberg, 1978). In general, the disability permeates all of the disabled

person's traits (Shearer, 1984; Wright, 1960). Secondly, the nondisabled person perceives his/her own vulnerability when in the company of the disabled person (Novak & Lerner, 1968). Finally, the nondisabled person may perceive a loss of social value by being seen with a "stigmatized" person (Goffman, 1963). Usually, however, this desire to avoid the disabled person must remain hidden because it is socially and probably personally unacceptable. As a result, nondisabled persons are in a double bind, i.e., they lose regardless of their behavioral choice.

Conflicting social and personal norms also affect the disabled person. This conflict is most related to the dimension of independence and dependence. Independence is highly valued in American society. Yet, if disabled persons act independently, their behavior will often violate social rules governing their behavior. For example, if the disability affects the person's ability to feed him/herself yet he/she opts to be independent and feed self, others may perceive his/her efforts as infantile and in violation of proper manners (Deegan, 1977, p. 739). However, if s/he allows someone else to feed him/her, this is viewed as dependence and the inability to care for self (Tucker, 1980). Thus, the disabled person loses if s/he behaves independently by behaving in a manner that violates the social rules governing the behavior and also loses when s/he acts in a dependent manner because society views dependent persons in a negative way. Thus, disabled persons are in a double bind, i.e., they lose regardless of his/her behavioral choice.

Conflicting social and personal norms result in conditions where both nondisabled and disabled communicators may feel they lose regardless of their behavioral choices. These conflcting norms affect how each communicator perceives self and the other and affect how each communicator inter-

prets the intentional messages of the other (interpersonal).

Interpersonal Level: This level of analysis focuses on the interpretation or misinterpretation of the intentional messages of the disabled and nondisabled communicator. Each approaches the communicative transaction with a high degree of uncertainty (Dahnke, 1982, p. 107), discomfort (Kleck, 1968), and situational ambiguity (Kelley et al., 1960). These perceptions of uncertainty, discomfort, and situational ambiguity are a result of conflicting social and personal norms. The effects are that both communicate in a constrained, self-conscious, overly controlled, and rigid way (Comer & Piliavan, 1972; Kelley et al., 1960). Each interprets the other's behavior as rejection (Emry & Wiseman, 1985) and/or as a negative evaluation of the worth of self (Dahnke, 1982, p. 94). In addition, nondisabled persons distort their positions and opinions to be consistent with the stereotypes of what disabled persons are thought to want to hear (Kleck, Ono, & Hastorf, 1966). Disabled persons interpret this behavior as inappropriate and feel they are not the recipients of authentic and empathetic communication (Braithwaite et al., 1984; Thompson, 1981). Similarly, the disabled person's perceptions of the communication situation are distorted as a result of the nondisabled person's contrived behavior. The disabled person's subsequent behavior is then interpreted by nondisabled persons as validation of the social stereotypes held of the disabled person (Gliedman & Roth, 1980).

Emry and Wiseman (1985) conclude that both disabled and nondisabled communicators misinterpret the communication efforts of the other. "Each sees the other communicating rejection" (p. 15). Each simultaneously miscommunicates by distorting ideas and opinions regarding the social stereotypes of disabled persons. These outcomes result from misperceptions (intrapersonal) and/or misinterpretations (interpersonal)

which, in turn, result in more misperceptions and misinterpretations in on-going interaction.

Systemic Level: Rohrlich argues that the on-going communication cycle "aggrandizes previous errors in perception or interpretation" and generates a dynamic not solely of the communicators but of their on-going interactions (1983, p. 201). The dynamics of their on-going communication generate an outcome beyond the intent of either communicator. This becomes most apparent when we apply Watzlawick, Bevin, and Jackson's axioms of communication (1967, pp. 48-70). Watzlawick et al. argue that "one cannot not communicate." Such an observation emphasizes the importance of nonverbal cues in on-going relationships. Gliedman and Roth (1980) suggest that to be visibly disabled is to possess a body that does not behave as social norms demand. Deegan argues that nondisabled persons are confused by the unusual or "bizarre" body motions (1977, p. 737) of the disabled person. Moreover, the nondisabled person employs social rules to interpret these nonverbal cues that can "lead to awkwardness, bewildered responses and avoidance by the non-handicapped" (Deegan, 1977, p. 738). The nondisabled person's response of discomfort, awkwardness, and avoidance can further impair the disabled person's ability to perform in the situation. This, in turn, further impacts the nondisabled person's response to the situation. Behavior constrains behavior. Moreover, previous perceptual and interpretive errors only further corrupt the relationship against the will of both participants.

Watzlawick et al. (1967) also argue that all messages contain relational statements. Relational statements can confirm, reject, or disconfirm the self-definition of the other. Disconfirmation seems central in understanding the prob'ematic nature of nondisabled and

disabled persons' communication. In on-going communicative relationships, nondisabled persons deny the disabled persons their right to define self by employing social stereotypes and by misinterpreting their nonverbal behavior. Based on the social stereotypes of disabled persons, the relational definition communicated by the nondisabled person denies the right of the disabled person to define self. Moreover, if the disabled person asserts a definition of self not consistent with the perceived stereotypes of disabled persons, the nondisabled person misinterprets the action and then makes additional perceptual errors. Now, the disabled person is perceived as angry, emotionally unstable, and maladjusted (Emry & Wiseman, 1985; Shearer, 1984) and the nondisabled person's self-definition as a good samaritan is disconfirmed. Thus, not only does the nondisabled person disconfirm any definition of the disabled person other than those defined by social stereotypes, but also assumes relational control.

In on-going communication, the nondisabled person often assumes a one-up helper role and simply takes control of the relationship (Braithwaite et al., 1984). As long as the disabled person accepts that complementary relationship, the transaction will flow more smoothly. Any attempt to redefine the relationship by exercising dominance and/or asserting selfhood will provoke a struggle over the definition of the relationship (Wilmot, 1979, p. 103). On the basis of this analysis, it can be argued that conflicting norms influence the communication between nondisabled and disabled persons. Nondisabled persons are faced with conflicting normative demands that create approach-avoidance reactions toward disabled persons. Disabled persons also face conflicting normative demands that compel them to act independent while at the same time accepting a one-down position in relation to nondisabled persons. Two research questions

arise: (1) Do nondisabled and disabled subjects perceive such normative demands on their behavior? and (2) Are there any differences between nondisabled and disabled subjects' perceptions of those normative demands?

One theory that examines the nature and dynamics of normative demands on communicators is the Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) model (Pearce & Cronen, 1980). CMM is primarily interested in explaining how humans attempt to achieve coordination through managing the way messages take on significance. This coordination between communicators takes place on a number of levels, ranging from the content of a message to the cultural patterns influencing the communicators (Pearce, Cronen, & Conklin, 1977). Both intrapersonal and interpersonal coordination of meaning is facilitated by the development of rules that organize each person's perceptions of the communication setting and govern on-going interactions (i.e., the systemic level) (Pearce, Harris, & Cronen, 1980). To the extent that these rules are shared by communicators, the possibility for mutual understanding is increased.

Communication rules, as a form of normative force, have been conceptualized and operationalized as <u>logical force</u>. Logical force refers to the strength of the normative obligations on a person's actions (Pearce & Cronen, 1980). The importance of the construct of logical force is noted by Nakanishi and Johnson (1985, p. 2) when they suggest the "CMM assumes that in conversations, persons seldom act in a random manner, instead the force which impels them to choose one act rather than another is variable and sometimes highly differentiated, such that important differences in logic of action emerge in different episodes, relationships, cultures, etc." Further, a number of researchers have found that logical force is transcultural and can be used to investigate

cultural differences in the normative demands on communicators (Kang & Pearce, in press; Pearce & Kang, 1980; Wolfson & Pearce, 1983).

Given the heuristic value of the logical force concept in studying cultural differences in the normative demands on various communication acts and contexts, we should be able to understand better the conflicting normative demands on disabled and nondisabled communicators. Specifically, we can now determine what forms and degrees of logical force are operative in communication contexts involving disabled and nondisabled persons. Furthermore, we can compare and contrast disabled and nondisabled subjects' perceptions of the logical forces operative in this form of communication.

METHODS

Sample

A total of 142 subjects volunteered to participate in the study. The 102 nondisabled subjects were undergraduate students enrolled in a western university. The 40 subjects with a disability were recruited from a variety of sources in a western metropolitan area, e.g., handicapped adults' centers, wheelchair basketball teams, and personal contacts. Of the 40 disabled subjects, nine were quadraplegic, twenty were paraplegic, and the remaining eleven were ambulatory. For the quadraplegic subjects, one of the authors served to record their responses, otherwise, all questionnaires were self-administered.

Questionnaire

One of the first tasks in constructing the questionnaire was to select and detail a situation involving a nondisabled and a disabled person which was realistic but problematic for the two subcultures. Based upon the intercultural model described above and the findings of a number of researchers in the area of disabled/nondisabled relations (e.g.,

Cronenulett, 1983; Gliedman & Roth, 1980), we decided that a situation that was somewhat ubiquitous and often problematic was that of a helping situation, i.e., a nondisabled person assisting a disabled person with a task related to the disability. After examining a number of possible helping situations, we decided upon one where a disabled person is attempting to get his/her wheelchair and self into his/her car and a nondisabled stranger comes to the scene and assists the disabled person with his/her task. We operationalized this particular helping situation with the following scenario in the questionnaire:

> You notice a young man in a wheelchair. The disabled person is positioning his chair so that he can get himself and his chair into his car. Then you see a nondisabled young man walk over to the disabled person. The nondisabled person states: "Here, I'll help you" and takes hold of the disabled person's chair and moves it to the proper position. He helps the disabled person into his car and then he loads the chair into the car. The disabled person thanks him and drives away.

We decided to specify the nondisabled and disabled actors in the scenario as males for two reasons: (1) to clarify the grammatical construction of the description of the scenario and (2) to attempt to control for differences in social stereotypes due to the gender of the actor.

The second task in constructing the questionnaire was the operationalization of logical force. Based upon Pearce and Cronen's (1980) measurement model for regulative rules, logical force was operationalized in terms of seven four-point Likert-type scales. These seven items were constructed to measure the normative obligations for each actor's behavior. Logical force consists of two interrelated forces. First, prefigurative force is the extent to which the act is perceived by the actor as obligated because of its linkage to some antecedent condition prior to the act. Five items were used to measure the strength of prefigurative force in the helping situation: (1) perceived link between

the nature of the episode and the act, (2) perceived link between the nature of the relationship and the act, (3) perceived link between self-concept and the act, (4) perceived link between cultural norms and the act, and (5) absence of any relationship between the act and the consequent conditions (i.e., functional autonomy). The operational statements for these prefigurative forces are indicated in Table 1. Second, another type of logical force is practical force, i.e., the extent to which the actor perceives the act as necessary to bring about certain outcomes. For our particular helping situation, two facets of practical force seemed most relevant: (1) the linkage from the act to the relationship and (2) the linkage from the act to the subsequent self-concept of the actor. The operational statements for these two forms of practical force are indicated by items six and seven in Table 1. Both sets of these items were rated on a four-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Table 1 about here

A third task in constructing the questionnaire was to ascertain relevant descriptors for the helping situation. These items provide an elaborated understanding of disabled and nondisabled subjects' perceptions of the helping situation. After considerable discussion regarding our particular helping scenerio and an examination of the research on the characteristics of nondisabled and disabled communicators (e.g., Weinberg, 1980), we derived eight relevant bipolar descriptors: independent/dependent, not helpful/helpful, unfriendly/friendly, inappropriate/appropriate, supportive/not supportive, understanding/not understanding, common/uncommon, and desirable/undesirable. Each of these semantic-

differential items were rated on a five-point scale.

The organization of the questionnaire was a follows: First, the questionnaire addressed human subjects' rights and provided a rationale for the study. Second, the helping scenerio was described. Third, the subjects were asked to rate the logical forces and bipolar adjectives for the nondisabled actor's behavior. Lastly, the subjects were asked to rate the logical forces and bipolar adjectives for the disabled actor's behavior. These data were the bases for the findings for the present study.

RESULTS

Nondisabled Actor's Behavior

Logical Forces. Table 2 presents the mean ratings of the subjects' assessments of the logical and practical forces governing the nondisabled actor's behavior in the scenerio. When comparing the levels of agreement across the items for the logical and practical forces, a consistent pattern emerges for both nondisabled and disabled subjects. Specifically, both disabled and nondisabled subjects felt the greatest forces on the nondisabled actor's behavior were exerted by the life script-to-act, act-to-relationship, and act-to-life script linkages.

Table 2 about here

A MANOVA of the subjects' ratings of the logical and practical forces on the nondisabled actor's behavior indicated that there was a significant difference between nondisabled and disabled subjects' perceptions (Pillai's criterion=.12, $F=2.59$, $df=7/131$, $p<.01$). Univariate ANOVAs for the items revealed that there was a significant difference between nondisabled and disabled subjects for only one logical force item. The

nondisabled subjects felt that the life script-to-act linkage was exerting greater force on the nondisabled actor's behavior than did the disabled subjects (means = 3.24 and 2.65, respectively).

Bipolar Descriptions. Table 2 presents the mean ratings of the subjects' bipolar descriptions of the nondisabled actor's behavior in the scenerio. A MANOVA of these data indicated that there was a significant difference between nondisabled and disabled subjects' perceptions (Pillai's criterion=.17, F=3.02, df=8/118, $p<.004$). Univariate ANOVAs for the bipolar items found significant differences between nondisabled and disabled subjects' perceptions for four of the eight items. The nondisabled subjects perceived the nondisabled actor's behavior as more independent, more helpful, more appropriate, and less common than did the disabled subjects. Conversely, the disabled subjects perceived the nondisabled actor's behavior as less independent, less helpful, less appropriate, and more common than did the nondisabled subjects.

Disabled Actor's Behavior

Logical Forces. Table 3 presents the mean ratings of the subjects' perceptions of each of the logical and practical forces governing the disabled actor's behavior in the scenario. A comparison of mean ratings across the items for logical and practical force items reveals one similar pattern for both nondisabled and disabled subjects. Both groups perceived the greatest forces on the disabled actor's behavior were exerted by the act-to-relationship, life script-to-act, and act-to-life script linkages.

Table 3 about here

A MANOVA of the subjects' ratings for the logical and practical forces on the disabled actor's behavior indicated that there was a significant

difference between disabled and nondisabled subjects' perceptions (Pillai's criterion-.11, F=2.16, df=7/127, p<.04). Univariate ANOVAs for the items indicated that there were significant differences between nondisabled and disabled subjects for three of the logical force items. This is, the disabled subjects felt that the episode-to-act, relationship-to-act, and cultural archetype-to-act linkages were exerting greater logical force on the disabled actor's behavior than did the nondisabled subjects.

Bipolar Descriptions. Table 3 presents the mean ratings of the subjects' bipolar descriptions of the disabled actor's behavior in the scenerio. A MANOVA of these ratings revealed that there was no significant difference between nondisabled and disabled subjects' perceptions (Pillai's criterion=.07, F=1.02, df=8/116, p=.42). Further, univariate ANOVAs of these items indicated only one significant difference between nondisabled and disabled subjects' perceptions, namely, nondisabled subjects perceived the disabled actor's behavior as more appropriate than did the disabled subjects.

DISCUSSION

Using predictions from a model of intercultural communication (Emry & Wiseman, 1985; Rohrlich, 1983) and the CMM methodology (Pearce & Cronen, 1980), we were able to segregate and identify the normative forces effecting the communication between disabled and nondisabled persons in a helping situation. The concept of logical force was useful in differentiating cross-cultural logics of these two groups. After close examination of our results, we were able to understand the problems of disconfirmation for disabled persons and gain a heightened sense of the relational power exerted by nondisabled persons. Nondisabled persons seem

compelled to act as they do (i.e., aid the disabled person) because of the life script-to-act linkage. This suggests that the nondisabled person's helping behavior was influenced by that person's perception of self and the obligations entailed in maintaining a favorable self-image. This finding is consistent with Kelley et al.'s (1960) position that society mandates that nondisabled persons should be kind and helpful to disabled persons. To do otherwise would be socially and personally unacceptable.

Our results suggest a more complex picture for disabled persons in helping situations. Both nondisabled and disabled subjects perceived that the disabled actor's acquiescence to the help was a result of the normative forces being exerted by the disabled actor's life script and desire to enhance the relationship with the nondisabled actor. Disabled persons are compelled to take one-down positions in order to fulfill societal and relational demands. A number of researchers have noted this problematic dimension of disabled persons' role in society (Clark, Weiman & Paschall, 1983; Comer & Piliavin, 1972; Gliedman & Roth, 1983; Shearer, 1984). One effect of this continuous asymmetric power relationship is a phenomenon called learned helplessness, i.e., the disabled person is taught to be dependent and expect personal failure (Brunstein & Olbrich, 1985; McClure, 1985). The nondisabled actor in our helping situation reinforces the sense of learned helplessness by assuming help is needed and acting on that untested assumption. The nondisabled person's goal seems to be one of "looking good" rather than helping.

Further, some notable differences were found between nondisabled and disabled subjects' perceptions of the normative forces on the disabled actor's behavior. Compared to nondisabled subjects' perceptions, disabled subjects felt there was greater situational demands (episode-to-act link), relational constraints (relationship-to-act link), and cultural

prescriptions (cultural archetype-to-act link) on the disabled actor's behavior. We can infer that disabled persons' behavior is more governed by the social milieu, whereas nondisabled persons' behavior is more consistent with their own personal life scripts. Disabled persons externalize the reasons for the problematic nature of the helping situation, while nondisabled persons attribute that problematic nature to the disabled person and act upon internal motivations to help.

By providing unsolicited "help," the nondisabled person confirms social stereotypes of disabled persons and disconfirms the disabled person's sense of selfhood. Here, the nondisabled person's understanding of the situation is tied to cultural ideology. The behavior is self-reinforcing. Since feedback is internal (doing right by one's life script) the need for consent by the disabled person is perceived unnecessary. From the disabled person's perspective, two obvious alternatives are open: either rebel against cultural expectations by refusing the help or acquiesce to the helping behavior which in turn will result in confirmation of the one-down position. As noted earlier, the disabled person is caught in a no-win double bind.

This study points to the need for further research in this area. One of the most important avenues for future research would be an examination of the communication strategies that disabled persons could use to neutralize the double bind created by conflicting normative demands. As we envision this research approach, investigators will need to identify relational management techniques that will both allow the disabled person to assert a sense of selfhood and be perceived by the nondisabled person as acting appropriately. The disabled person needs to acknowledge the positive aspects of the helping behavior, but also needs to increase

nondisabled persons' sensitivity to the needs of the disabled subculture. Thompson's (1981, 1982) research on the use of disclosure-regarding-disability as a relationship management technique would provide a starting point for this research approach. The present study and the suggested future research should advance our understanding of the communication between disabled and nondisabled persons and ameliorate its problematic nature.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Braithwaite, D. O., Emry, R. A., & Wiseman, R. L. (1984, February). Able-bodied and disabled persons' communication: The disabled person's perspective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Seattle.

Brunstein, J. C., & Olbrich, E. (1985). Personal helplessness and action control: Analysis of achievement-related cognitions, self-assessments and performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1540-1551.

Clark, A. J., Weiman, L. A., & Paschall, K. A. (1983). A preliminary report of an investigation of unwillingness to communicate among physically handicapped persons. Journal of the Communication Association of the Pacific, 12, 155-160.

Comer, R. J., & Piliavin, J. A. (1972). The effects of physical deviance upon face-to-face interaction: The other side. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23, 33-39.

Cronenulett, L. R. (1983). Helping and nursing models. Nursing Research, 32, 342-346.

Dahnke, G. L. (1982). Communication between handicapped and nonhandicapped persons: Toward a deductive theory. In M. Burgoon (ed.), Communication Yearbook 6 (pp. 92-135). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Deegan, M. J. (1977). The nonverbal communication of the physically handicapped. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 4, 735-748.

Emry, R., & Wiseman, R. L. (1985, November). An intercultural understanding of the communication between ablebodied and disabled persons. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Denver.

Farina, A., Sherman, M., & Allen, J. G. (1968). Role of physical abnormalities in perception and behavior. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 73, 590-593.

Gliedman, J., & Roth, W. (1980). The unexpected minority: Handicapped children in America. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Jovanovich.

Goffman, I. (1963). Stigma. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Heinemann, W., Pellander, F., Vogelbusch, A., & Wojtek, B. (1981). Meeting a deviant person: Subjective norms and affective reactions. European Journal of Social Psychology, 11, 1-25.

Kang, K., & Pearce, W. B. (in press). Reticence: A transcultural analysis. Communication.

Kelley, H. H., Hastorf, A. H., Jones, E. E., Thibaut, J. W., & Usdane, W. M. (1960). Some implications of social psychological theory for research on the handicapped. In L. Lofquist (ed.), Psycological

research and rehabilitation (pp. 172-204). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kleck, R. (1966). Emotional arousal in interactions with stigmatized persons. Psychological Reports, 19, 1226.

Kleck, R. (1968). Physical stigma and nonverbal cues emitted in face-to-face interactions. Human Relations, 21, 19-28.

Kleck, R. (1969). Physical stigma and task oriented interactions. Human Relations, 22, 53-60.

Kleck, R., Ono, H., & Hastorf, A. J. (1966). The effects of physical deviance upon face-to-face interaction. Human Relations, 19, 425-436.

McClure, J. (1985). The social parameter of "learned" helplessness: Its recognition and implication. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1534-1539.

Nakanishi, M., & Johnson, K. M. (1975, November). Implications of self disclosure on conversational logics, perceived communication competence, and social attraction: A comparison of Japanese and American cultures. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Denver.

Novak, P. W., & Lerner, M. J. (1968). Rejection as a consequence of perceived similarity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9, 147-152.

Pearce, W. B., & Cronen, V. E. (1980). Communication, action, and Meaning: The creation of social realities. New York: Praeger.

Pearce, W. B., Cronen, V. E., & Conklin, F. (1977, May). A hierarchical model of interpersonal communication. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, West Berlin.

Pearce, W. B., Harris, L. M., & Cronen, V. E. (1980). The coordinated management of meaning: Human communication in a new key. In J. Weakland & C. Wilder-Mott (eds.), Rigor and imagination: Essays on communication from the interactional view. New York: Praeger.

Pearce, W. B., & Kang, K. (1980, February). Acculturation and communication competence: A case study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Oceanside, MD.

Rohrlich, P. E. (1983). Toward a unified conception of intercultural communication: An integrated systems approach. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 7, 191-209.

Shearer, A. (1984). Disability: Whose handicap? Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher, Ltd.

Thompson, T. L. (1981, November). You can't play marbles -- You have a wooden hand: Communication with the handicapped. Paper presented at

the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Anaheim, CA.

Thompson, T. L. (1982). Disclosure as a disability-management strategy: A review and conclusions. Communication Quarterly, 30, 196-202.

Tucker, S. J. (1980). The psychology of spinal cord injury: Patient-staff interaction. Rehabilitation Literature, 41, 114-121.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J., & Jackson, D. (1967). Pragmatics of human communication. New York: Norton.

Weinberg, N. (1978). Modifying social stereotypes of the physically disabled. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 22, 114-124.

Wilmot, W. W. (1979). Dyadic communication. Menlo Park: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Wolfson, K., & Pearce, W. B. (1983). A cross-cultural comparison of the implications of self-disclosure on conversational logics. Communication Monographs, 31, 249-256.

Wright, B. A. (1960). Physical disability: A psychological approach. New York: Harper & Row.

TABLE 1

Operationalizations of Logical Force

1. Episode-to-Act Linkage

   The nondisabled/disabled person would have to respond this way because of the kind of situation he and the disabled/nondisabled person are having.

2. Relationship-to-Act Linkage

   The nondisabled/disabled person would have to respond this way because of the kind of relationship he has with the disabled/nondisabled person.

3. Life Script-to-Act Linkage

   The nondisabled/disabled person acted this way because of who he is as a person and how he should act.

4. Cultural Archetype-to-Act Linkage

   The nondisabled/disabled person acted this way because it was the way a nondisabled/disabled person should act.

5. Functional Autonomy

   In this situation, the nondisabled/disabled person would act this way, no matter what the disabled/nondisabled person might say next.

6. Act-to-Relationship Linkage

   The nondisabled/disabled person's action will help him improve his relationship with the disabled/nondisabled person.

7. Act-to-Life Script Linkage

   The nondisabled/disabled person responded this way in order to help him create a good self-image in the situation.

TABLE 2

Ratings of the Nondisabled Actor's Behavior

Logical Forces	ND Ss	DA Ss	p
Episode-to-Act Linkage	2.06	1.90	.24
Relationship-to-Act Linkage	1.95	1.80	.26
Life Script-to-Act Linkage	3.24	2.65	.00
Cultural Archetype-to-Act Linkage	2.34	2.18	.26
Functional Autonomy	1.95	2.08	.38
Act-to-Relationship Linkage	2.85	2.78	.57
Act-to-Life Script Linkage	2.53	2.62	.57
Bipolar Descriptions			
Independent/Dependent	2.15	2.69	.02
Not Helpful/Helpful	4.53	3.94	.00
Unfriendly/Friendly	4.47	4.25	.17
Inappropriate/Appropriate	3.63	3.19	.05
Supportive/Not Supportive	2.13	2.38	.30
Understanding/Not Understanding	2.06	2.41	.17
Common/Uncommon	3.51	2.81	.00
Desirable/Undesirable	2.25	2.50	.30

TABLE 3

Ratings of the Disabled Actor's Behavior

Logical Forces	ND Ss	DA Ss	p
Episode-to-Act Linkage	2.22	2.50	.05
Relationship-to-Act Linkage	1.82	2.17	.01
Life Script-to-Act Linkage	2.75	2.56	.20
Cultural Archetype-to-Act Linkage	1.91	2.17	.04
Functional Autonomy	2.03	2.08	.71
Act-to-Relationship Linkage	2.81	2.97	.30
Act-to-Life Script Linkage	2.30	2.44	.35
Bipolar Descriptions			
Independent/Dependent	3.17	2.97	.44
Not Helpful/Helpful	3.40	3.53	.49
Unfriendly/Friendly	4.27	4.13	.41
Inappropriate/Appropriate	3.85	3.43	.05
Supportive/Not Supportive	2.36	2.43	.70
Understanding/Not Understanding	2.00	2.20	.27
Common/Uncommon	2.64	2.57	.72
Desirable/Undesirable	2.31	2.47	.49